
SECOND PERSONAL STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE RESTRICTION ORDER APPLICATION (ANONYMITY APPLICATION) MADE BY EN39 PURSUANT TO SECTION 19(2) OF THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005

1. I make this statement in support of an application for a restriction order pursuant to section 19(2) of the Inquiries Rules in respect of my true and cover identities. I make this statement further to the detailed personal statement that was provided to the Inquiry on my behalf on 13 March 2017 (“my first personal statement.”)
2. In an email sent to the NCA’s Legal team by the Undercover Policing Inquiry team on 11 May 2017, I was asked to answer the following questions in this personal statement:
 - (i) **Which cover or nick name(s) were used in the NPOIU deployments?**
 - (ii) **What risk arises specifically from revelation of that cover or nick name(s)?**
 - (iii) **Were those cover names the same or different from the cover names used in context of the non-NPOIU criminal deployments the officer has cited?**
 - (iv) **If different, how does the revelation of the NPOIU related cover name reveal the other different cover names used in non-NPOIU criminal deployments such that the risk is created?**
3. I propose to address each question in turn during the course of this personal statement.
 - (i) **Which cover or nick name(s) were used in the NPOIU deployments?**
4. I have provided the Inquiry with details of cover name(s) / nick name(s) used during my deployment.
 - (ii) **What risk arises specifically from revelation of that cover or nick name(s)?**
5. I have already set out, in some detail, in my first personal statement, the risks that would arise from the revelation of my NPOIU cover name. However, I have reiterated (and, where necessary, expanded upon) those risks below, for ease of reference.
6. If my cover name was to be revealed, the work that I carried out in order to build and develop my legend would be exposed into the public domain. This would be extremely damaging to past, current and future undercover operations as it would highlight the detailed steps that I had undertaken in order to create and develop a credible legend.
7. The details of how undercover officers build their legends (and the time/steps taken to do so) are not in the public domain and it is for that reason that legends can continue to be

developed successfully, remain credible and withstand what can sometimes be very intense scrutiny from those that they have infiltrated.

8. I am concerned that, were the details of my legend building to be revealed undercover officers who have used similar tactics in the past would be placed under increased scrutiny from those that they had infiltrated.

(iii) Were those cover names the same or different from the cover names used in context of the non-NPOIU criminal deployments the officer has cited?

9. The cover name that I used during the course of my employment in the NPOIU has not, to date, been used during the course of the undercover deployments that I have carried out whilst working in serious organised crime but could be linked by other factors.

(iv) If different, how does the revelation of the NPOIU related cover name reveal the other different cover names used in non-NPOIU criminal deployments such that the risk is created?

10. Although the cover names that I used for non-NPOIU deployments are different to my NPOIU cover name, there is a risk that they could be linked.
11. Were my cover names in the non-NPOIU criminal deployments to be exposed, there would also, in my view, be wider collateral damage, including the potential compromise of other undercover officers, addresses, tactics and backstopping techniques used during the course of those deployments which could also, by extension, lead to the compromise of or prejudice to similar operations in the future.
12. In conclusion, I believe that, were my NPOIU cover name to be revealed, there is a very real risk that my non-NPOIU cover names would also be exposed. I am aware of at least one on-going threat related to an individual suspected of murder.
13. I believe that the contents of this statement are true.

Signed: [Redacted]

Dated: